

**IN THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**Patent Application**

<b>Inventor(s):</b>	Yoad Gidron et al.	<b>Serial No.:</b>	10/573,832
<b>Case:</b>	Mobilitec 5	<b>Filed:</b>	12/05/2006
<b>Examiner:</b>	Choo, Munsoon	<b>Group Art Unit:</b>	2617
<b>Confirmation #:</b>	5200		

**Title:** SERVICE PLATFORM FOR CELLULAR TELEPHONY

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450**

**SIR:**

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Appellants submit this Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on appeal from the decision of the Examiner of Group Art Unit 2617 mailed July 15, 2010 rejecting claims 36-54 and 56-68.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this Appeal Brief to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this Appeal Brief, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for.

An Appeal Brief filing fee has been paid. Appellants do not believe that any fees are due. In the event Appellants are incorrect, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees to Deposit Account No. 50-4802/ALU/MOBILITEC5.

# Table of Contents

1.	Identification Page.....	1
2.	Table of Contents .....	2
3.	Real Party in Interest .....	3
4.	Related Appeals and Interferences .....	3
5.	Status of Claims .....	3
6.	Status of Amendments .....	3
7.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter .....	3
8.	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal .....	7
9.	Arguments .....	8
10.	Conclusion .....	16
11.	Claims Appendix .....	17
12.	Evidence Appendix .....	23
13.	Related Proceedings Appendix .....	23

### **Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest is Alcatel Lucent.

### **Related Appeals and Interferences**

Appellants assert that no appeals or interferences are known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 36-68 are pending in the application. Claims 1-33 were originally presented in the application. Claims 34-68 were added by amendment. Claims 1-35 have been cancelled. Claim 36 has been amended. The rejection of claims 36-68 is appealed.

### **Status of Amendments**

All claim amendments have been entered.

### **Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

Embodiments of the present invention are generally directed to apparatus and methods for providing a platform for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network. The apparatus comprises an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service. The generic definition incorporates common features of different services and is able to take specific service-defining parameters, wherein the infrastructure facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols. The apparatus further comprises an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to the generic definition, to thereby implement a desired service through said generic definition. The generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices. The method comprises providing a generic definition of a cellular service, the generic definition incorporating common features of different services, and the generic definition is able to take specific service-defining parameters wherein the cellular telephone network facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different

protocols, and for each one of a plurality of desired services, inputting respective service defining parameters to the generic definition, to thereby implement a desired service through the generic definition wherein the generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.

For the convenience of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, Appellants' independent claims 36, 45, 51 and 62 are presented below with citations to various figures and appropriate citations to at least one portion of the specification for elements of the appealed claims.

Claim 36 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

36. (Previously Presented) Apparatus providing a platform for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network, the apparatus comprising: (FIG. 1, 10)

an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters, wherein the infrastructure facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols; and

(FIG. 2, Pg. 4:1-32; Pg. 9:11-Pg. 11:3; Pg. 12:23-29; Pg. 13:20-25)

an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition, said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices. (Pg. 2:16-18; Pg. 4:23-27; Pg. 3:19-29).

Claim 45 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

45. (Previously Presented) A method for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network comprising:

providing a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, and said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters wherein the cellular telephone network facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols, and (FIG. 2, Pg. 4:1-32; Pg. 9:11-Pg. 11:3; Pg. 12:23-29; Pg. 13:20-25)

for each one of a plurality of desired services, inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices. (Pg. 4:5-27).

Claim 51 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

51. (Previously Presented) A method for managing a content delivery interface between a content provider and a subscriber wireless communication device, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of modules for the content delivery interface, each module for providing content as part of a different service wherein delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols is facilitated; (Pg. 4:31-32)

providing a generic definition of said service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services; selecting an appropriate one of said modules for the content delivery interface according to a currently desired service and said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices; and (FIG. 2, Pg. 4:1-32; Pg. 9:11-Pg. 11:3; Pg. 12:23-29; Pg. 13:20-25)

adding said appropriate module to the content delivery interface, thereby to provide said currently desired service from a platform that supports a plurality of services. (Pg. 4:6-24).

Claim 62 recites (with references to illustrative portions of the specification added):

62. (Previously Presented) A service delivery platform for an interface between a content provider and a wireless communication device, comprising: (FIG. 6, Pg. 19:20-Pg. 20:21)

- a plurality of services for being provided to the wireless communication device by the content provider; (FIG. 7, 112, 114; Pg. 20:9)

- an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services; (FIG. 2, Pg. 9:29-31; Pg. 4:1-32)

- a service controller for receiving a request for a service from the wireless communication device and for activating said service according to a service logic and said generic definition, wherein said service logic comprises at least one rule for determining at least one of whether and how said service is to be provided; and (FIG. 7, 110; Pg. 20:7-8; Pg. 6:20-23)

- a service framework, configured to enable ones of said services to be added, removed or changed. (FIG. 6; Pg. 6:24-25).

**GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

I. Claims 36-54 and 56-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Kloba (US 2002/0052916, hereinafter Kloba).

## ARGUMENTS

### I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 36-54 and 56-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Kloba. The rejection is traversed.

#### A.1. Rejection of claim 36.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kloba. Appellants urge to the contrary.

I. The Examiner Failed To Establish A Prima Facie Showing Of Anticipation Because Kloba Fails To Teach Exactly What Is Claimed.

Appellants initially<sup>1</sup> show error in the rejection of claim 1 in that the Examiner failed to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of anticipation<sup>2</sup>. (See MPEP §2131.03 (III)).

The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, because Kloba fails to teach exactly what is claimed and with the required specificity. (emphasis added). The Kloba reference fails to disclose exactly what is claimed in Appellants' independent claim 36 as required by the rules. Specifically, contrary to the Examiner's suggestion, Kloba does not appear to teach at least the following features recited in the claims:

"an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters;" and

"an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition."

The Examiner cites ¶101 for the proposition that Kloba discloses the above features. In addition, the Examiner provided pertinent explanation.

<sup>1</sup> In the Appeal Briefs filed September 24, 2009, and December 29, 2009, Appellants argued that the claims were erroneously rejected.

<sup>2</sup> According to MPEP §2131.03 (III) "Anticipation under §102 can be found only when the reference discloses exactly what is claimed and that where there are differences between the reference disclosure and the claim, the rejection must be based on §103 which takes differences into account. Furthermore, in order to anticipate the claims, the claimed subject matter must be disclosed in the reference with "sufficient specificity to constitute an anticipation under the statute." See MPEP §2131.03 (II). (emphasis added).



In the rejection, the Examiner construes “collection of channels” as “generic definition” by appending next to above claimed feature the comment:

“(P[101]: The server maintains/supports a collection of channels generally, said “collection of channels” can be defined as “generic definition” incorporating many common/general/generic services/channels. Note: “Said collection of channels” is a collection of general/generic channels; see P [50] for cellular service)”.  
(See office action, page 3).

The Examiner’s claim construction, however, appears flawed.

2) *Kloba Fails To Teach Claimed Recitation: Examiner Disregards The Clear Teachings Of The Specification.*

As articulated above, the Examiner appends a note next to the claimed limitation “an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service.” The Examiner did not provide any other explanation other than the comment; therefore, Appellants reasonably conclude that the Examiner may believe that generic definition can be construed as “collection of channels.” However, the prior art does not support this assertion. The Examiner cites ¶101 in support of the rejection. The cited passage is reproduced here for ease of reference.

“Generally, the server 104 maintains a collection of channels. In an embodiment, a channel comprises a collection of objects. An object is any entity that can be transferred to a client 108, such as but not limited to content, applications, services, images, movies, music, links, etc.” Kloba ¶101

As can be seen, a “collection of channels” comprises a collection of objects. An object is any entity that can be transferred to a client 108, such as but not limited to content, applications, services, images, movies, music, links, etc. It therefore, follows that a collection of channels comprises a collection of content, applications, services, images, movies, music, links, etc. As stated above, the Examiner construes the claimed generic definition to a “collection of channels.” Kloba’s deficiencies come to light when this claim construction is applied to the claimed feature:

“an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service.”

Having determined based on the Examiner’s claim construction approach that “a collection of channels comprises a collection of content, applications, services, images,

movies, music, links, etc.,” we now need to compare this construct of “a collection of channels” with the definition of “a generic definition” as described in the specification.

On page 4, beginning at line 7, the specification provides:

“Preferably, said generic definition comprises at least some of the following features of a service: availability, discoverability, findability, buyability, and obtainability.”

As can be seen, generic definition, i.e., availability, discoverability, findability, buyability, and obtainability is quite different from a collection of channels, i.e., content, applications, services, images, movies, music, links. But, the Examiner ignored those teachings of the specification in rejecting the claims.

According to MPEP §2111.01(IV):

“Where an explicit definition is provided by the Applicant for a term, that definition will control interpretation of the term as it is used in the claim.”

As articulated above, the specification provides a clear context for persons skilled in the art to understand the term “generic definition” as comprising availability, discoverability, findability, buyability, and obtainability. It is entirely appropriate when conducting claim construction, to rely heavily on the written description for guidance as to the meaning of the claims. Importantly, the person of ordinary skill in the art is deemed to read the claim term not only in the context of the particular claim in which the disputed term appears, but *in the context of the specification.*” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*). Indeed, the *Phillips* Court stressed that “the specification is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” *Id.* at 1315 (quotation omitted). Accordingly, “[i]t is therefore entirely appropriate . . . when conducting claim construction, to rely *heavily* on the written description for guidance as to the meaning of the claims.” *Id.*, 415 F.3d at 1317, 75 U.S.P.Q.2d 1329 (citation omitted, emphasis added).

Thus, the Examiner’s interpretation of a claim term cannot contradict the use of that term within “the context of the entire patent, including the specification.”

Stated differently, since the *Phillips* Court requires the Examiner to “rely heavily on the written description for guidance as to the meaning of the claims,” it is not proper

to impute to a claim term any meaning or scope that is inconsistent with the guidance provided in a written description as to the meaning of the claims. In the instant case, the Examiner incorrectly imputes “a collection of channels” to the claimed “a generic definition.”

Appellants have, thus shown that there are missing claimed features not taught or suggested by the cited reference; and thus, claim 36 has been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

3. *Kloba Lacks The Required Specificity Under 102: The Examiner Fails To Cite The Best References.*

As shown above, the Examiner failed to properly establish “any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art.” More importantly, in order to anticipate the claims, the claimed subject matter must be disclosed in the reference with “sufficient specificity to constitute an anticipation under the statute.” See MPEP §2131.03 (II). (emphasis added). The differences between Kloba and the claimed embodiments are numerous. Said differences between the reference and the claimed embodiments give rise to a substantial gap, which is not accounted for.

The Examiner should cite the best reference at his/her disposal as set forth in the MPEP and 37 CFR §1.104. Specifically, 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2) provides:

“In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.”

The Examiner failed to properly establish “any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art,” which is one of the *Graham* factual inquiry or determination. See *KSR Int’l v. Teleflex, Inc.* 550 U.S. 398, 418, 82 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1385, 1396 (2007). Given their proper weight, the factual basis underlying the *Graham* factors inquiry clearly supports a finding of novelty with respect to the claimed embodiments. Accordingly, the Examiner’s burden in making factual determinations set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966) is not met.

Therefore, because the Examiner's arguments in support of the §102 rejection fail, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established; and thus, independent claim 36 is allowable over Kloba under 35 U.S.C. §102.

4. *Incorrect Claim Construction: The Examiner Failed To Accord Patentable Weight To Key Phrases.*

Appellants could not discern any reference that fairly suggests "common features of different services." As articulated above, Kloba is completely silent with respect to such a feature. In order for the Examiner to construe the claim as such, apparently the phrases "common features" and "specific service defining parameters" were not accorded any patentable weight within the context of the claims. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. (See MPEP §2143.03). One cannot divine claim meaning in a vacuum. *Philips v. AWH Corporation* (Fed. Cir. July 12, 2005).

The Examiner glosses over the weaknesses and shortcomings of the reference in order to justify the rejection. There is no teaching relating to the specific features in Appellants' claim 36; namely, an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters.

Appellants have, thus shown that there are missing claimed features not taught or suggested by the cited reference; and thus, claim 36 has been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

5. *The Examiner Fails To Establish A Prima Facie Showing Of Anticipation Because Kloba Fails To Teach Exactly What Is Claimed.*

The Kloba reference fails to disclose exactly what is claimed in Appellants' independent claim 36.

It is well settled that in order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) to be appropriate, it requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Further, according to MPEP

§2131.03 (III) “Anticipation under §102 can be found only when the reference discloses exactly what is claimed and that where there are differences between the reference disclosure and the claim, the rejection must be based on §103 which takes differences into account. (emphasis added). More specifically, as recited in independent claim 36, Kloba does not teach or suggest at least:

“an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters,” (emphasis added).

The Examiner suggests that Kloba discloses the above claimed limitation. Specifically, the Examiner again cites ¶101 in support of the rejection. The Examiner further comments:

“Said “Collection of channels” incorporating [sic] many common channels. Channels can be common services such as application, services, images, movies, music.”

However, nowhere does Kloba disclose “common features of different services” (emphasis added) as claimed and described in the specification. On page 9, beginning 19, the specification provides:

The generic definition includes the following features that characterize a content service over the cellular network and which are shared between all services. First of all there is provisioning 16, or the availability of the service as an entity on the network. Secondly there is discoverability 18, the need for a service to make users aware of its existence. Thirdly there is findability 20, the way in which users, aware of the existence of the service, can find it. Fourthly there is what may be termed buyability 22, the financial conditions under which the service is made available to the consumer, and finally there is obtainability 24, the way in which the consumer can actually obtain the service. All of these features are generic to content services provided over the cellular network and to date are designed and integrated independently for each service. The platform of the present embodiments provides these features in a single integration and allows the service providers merely to have to define parameters in order to implement their different services.

Appellants could not discern any reference that fairly suggests “common features of different services” as defined above. Features are distinct from the services. Two unrelated services may have common features. Here the features are integrated; thus, allowing service providers to simply define parameters in order to implement their different services. Kloba is silent about integrated features; rather, Kloba discloses services such as content, applications, services, images, movies, music, links. Therefore,

because Kloba suggests services as opposed to features of the services, Kloba actually suggests an arrangement that is entirely different from Appellants' claimed embodiment. Therefore, Kloba does not teach or suggest the "common features of different services" feature of Appellants' claim 36.

6. Conclusion

Having clearly demonstrated Kloba's deficiencies, Appellants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion in Kloba that would have resulted in Appellants' claimed embodiments as provided in independent claim 36.

**A.2. Claims 45, 51 and 62.**

Claims 45, 51 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over Kloba. Appellants urge to the contrary.

As articulated above with respect to claim 36, Kloba fails to teach exactly all elements of independent claims 45, 51 and 62 as required under 35 U.S.C. §102 for establishing a *prima facie* showing of anticipation. Independent claims 45, 51 and 62 recite at least some of the elements of independent claim 36 that are discussed above. As such, and at least for the same reasons as discussed above, independent claims 45, 51 and 62 also are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Kloba.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent claims 45, 51 and 62 also are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Kloba.

**A.3. Claims 37-44, 46-50, 52-54, 56-61 and 63-68.**

Claims 37-44, 46-50, 52-54, 56-61 and 63-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over Kloba. Appellants urge to the contrary.

This ground of rejection applies only to dependent claims, and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 given Kloba as applied to independent claims 36, 45, 51 and 62 above.

As articulated above with respect to claims 36, 45, 51 and 62, there are missing claimed features not taught/suggested by the cited references – including "providing a generic definition of said service, said generic definition incorporating common features

of different services; selecting an appropriate one of said modules for the content delivery interface according to a currently desired service and said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.”

(emphasis added). — and thus, dependent claims 37-44, 46-50, 52-54, 56-61 and 63-68 have been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). The Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* showing of anticipation.

Therefore, Appellants’ claims 37-44, 46-50, 52-54, 56-61 and 63-68 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Kloba.

**Conclusion**

Thus, Appellants submit that all of the claims presently in the application are allowable.

For the reasons advanced above, Appellants respectfully urge that the rejection of claims 36-54 and 56-68 is improper. Reversal of the rejection of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/16/10

EJ Wall

Eamon J. Wall  
Registration No. 39,414  
Wall & Tong, L.L.P.  
25 James Way  
Eatontown, New Jersey 07724  
Telephone: (732) 542-2280 x120  
Facsimile: (732) 542-2283  
Attorney for Appellant(s)



## CLAIMS APPENDIX

1-35. (Cancelled).

36. (Previously Presented) Apparatus providing a platform for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network, the apparatus comprising

an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters, wherein the infrastructure facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols; and

an external parameter setting mechanism for inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition, said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.

37. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, wherein said generic definition comprises an ability to select between one of a plurality of levels of complexity of content presentation according to a determined capability level of a receiving telephone.

38. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, carrying a plurality of services each defined using said generic service and different service defining parameters.

39. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, configured to allow a plurality of services to be defined using different service-defining parameters applied to said generic service.

40. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, further comprising a rule engine together with said generic definition, for operating logic required for said desired service by implementing ones of said service defining parameters that are logical rules.

41. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, further comprising an external

parameter obtaining mechanism to obtain external parameters for modifying application of a respective desired service to a user.

42. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 41, wherein said external parameter is location of a respective mobile telephone, and wherein said modifying comprises modifying said application in accordance with a respective location.

43. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, comprising a plurality of modules, each module carrying said generic definition together with a different arrangement of parameters, thereby to combine different services within said platform.

44. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 43, being able to support additional services by the incorporation of additional modules.

45. (Previously Presented) A method for the provision of services over a cellular telephone network comprising:

providing a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services, and said generic definition being able to take specific service-defining parameters wherein the cellular telephone network facilitates the delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols, and

for each one of a plurality of desired services, inputting respective service defining parameters to said generic definition, thereby to implement a desired service through said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices.

46. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, wherein said generic definition comprises an ability to select between one of a plurality of levels of complexity of content presentation according to a determined capacity level of a receiving telephone.

47. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, comprising defining a plurality of

services each using said generic service and different service defining parameters, and providing each service as a separate module sharing a common interface.

48. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, further comprising operating logic required for a respective desired service by implementing ones of said service defining parameters that are logical rules.

49. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 45, further comprising obtaining external parameters for modifying application of a respective desired service to a user.

50. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 49, wherein said external parameter is location of a respective mobile telephone, and wherein said modifying comprises modifying said application in accordance with a respective location.

51. (Previously Presented) A method for managing a content delivery interface between a content provider and a subscriber wireless communication device, the method comprising:

- providing a plurality of modules for the content delivery interface, each module for providing content as part of a different service wherein delivery of multiple content types to different devices using different protocols is facilitated;

- providing a generic definition of said service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services; selecting an appropriate one of said modules for the content delivery interface according to a currently desired service and said generic definition wherein said generic definition includes consideration of resource constraints of the different devices; and

- adding said appropriate module to the content delivery interface, thereby to provide said currently desired service from a platform that supports a plurality of services.

52. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 51, wherein said adding said appropriate one of said modules comprises providing a functional alteration for the

content delivery interface for interacting with the wireless communication device, according to said currently desired service.

53. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, wherein said functional alteration comprises a change to a flow of interaction between the content delivery interface and the wireless communication device.

54. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, wherein said functional alteration comprises a change to the look and feel of the content delivery interface at the wireless communication device.

55. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 53, wherein said functional alteration comprises:

- adding a new content type;
- adding a new content delivery protocol; Adding a new device and adjusting the user interface to its browser and its display characteristics;
- adding a new page;
- adding content bundles that include multiple content items;
- changing the look and feel of the service, including at least one of colors, fonts, icons, formatting and page layout; and
- changing parameters of the service.

56. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, wherein said functional alteration comprises a change in a respective service according to an identity of a subscriber, a service package of said subscriber, a preference of said subscriber and a type of wireless communication device.

57. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 56, wherein said change comprises dynamic adaptation of the service, optionally including at least one of:  
matching the output format and presentation to the device type;

filtering of content, based on at least one of permissions, compatibility to the device, subscriber preferences, and content classification;

selection of a language;

dynamic flow; and

adjustment of delivery protocol based on the content type and the device.

58. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 52, comprising providing each module with a generic service definition and customizing ones of said modules for services it is desired to provide.

59. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 58, wherein the content delivery interface further comprises a service directory for locating a service, such that said adding said appropriate module further comprises altering a listing in said service directory as necessary when a service is added, removed or altered.

60. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 58, wherein the content delivery interface further defines a presentation for providing an output of said service to the wireless communication device, such that said functional alteration comprises altering said presentation as necessary when a service is added, removed or altered.

61. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 58, wherein said functional alteration comprises altering a logic of said service.

62. (Previously Presented) A service delivery platform for an interface between a content provider and a wireless communication device, comprising:

a plurality of services for being provided to the wireless communication device by the content provider;

an infrastructure for supporting a generic definition of a cellular service, said generic definition incorporating common features of different services;

a service controller for receiving a request for a service from the wireless communication device and for activating said service according to a service logic and

said generic definition, wherein said service logic comprises at least one rule for determining at least one of whether and how said service is to be provided; and

a service framework, configured to enable ones of said services to be added, removed or changed.

63. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 62, further comprising a service directory for listing ones of said services, and wherein said service controller is configured to search said service directory for said service upon receiving said request.

64. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 62, wherein said service comprises a plurality of operations to be performed, and a response to be returned to the wireless communication device.

65. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 64, further comprising a presentation for presenting said response of said service.

66. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 65, wherein said presentation comprises a presentation assembler for collecting data and preparing said data for said response to the wireless communication device.

67. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 62, wherein an operation of said service is performed according to at least one rule.

68. (Previously Presented) The delivery platform of claim 67, further comprising a rule operation for constructing the condition for said rule.

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.